

**RECEIVED**

MAR 12 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 3711PATENT
Y00-044**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**In re Application of: MICHAEL D. BULLOCK ET AL
Serial No.: 09/735,002
Filed: December 12, 2000
For: PRACTICE PUTTER AND HEAD: Date: March 4, 2003
:
: Group Art Unit: 3711
:
: Examiner: Thanh P. Duong**RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D. C. 20231OK To Enk
TO 3/19/03

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed January 14, 2003, please consider the following remarks regarding the allowability of the above-identified patent application.

REMARKS

Regarding the status of the present application, Claims 1 and 9 have been amended and Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that the present response does not require further searching on the part of the Examiner. It is also respectfully submitted that this response places this application in condition for allowance, or in any event, places it in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,489,415 issued to Smith in view of US Patent No. 5,135,228 issued to Hawkins, Sr. The Examiner has essentially repeated the rejection stated in the prior Office Action. Notwithstanding the Examiner's rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is not obvious in view of the Smith and Hawkins, Sr. patents, taken singly or together.

The teachings of the Smith and Hawkins, Sr. patents were discussed in the prior Office Action. Suffice it to say that these references each disclose attachments for a golf putter and do not disclose or suggest a unitary putter head comprising a single, solid, unitary body that is attached to a putter shaft. None of the devices disclosed or suggested by the Smith or Hawkins, Sr. patents provide for a putter head comprising a single, solid, unitary body.

With respect to the limitation "single, solid, and unitary body", the Examiner has argued that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to either fabricate the front surface with a relatively small, centrally-located, and flat sweet spot as an attachment or as an integral piece of the practice putter head, since it has been held that forming one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put